

## A Study of the Campeyya Jātaka, Including Remarks on the Text of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka

There is an obvious historical problem in the textual criticism of the Campeyya Jātaka (no. 506, Ja IV 454–68). Although it has been transmitted in forty-four gāthās, it is found in the Vīsati-nipāta, which indicates that the original version of the Jātaka comprised about twenty gāthās. This is clearly evident when it is compared with the other Jātakas of this nipāta.<sup>1</sup> This fact alone would be enough to show that the Jātaka has been revised and extended as it has been handed down. What follows is an attempt to trace the textual history of this nāga Jātaka, also taking into account the Mahāvastu version (Mvu II 181–88), although it

---

An earlier version of this article was first published in German under the title “Eine Studie des Campeyya-Jātaka (mit textkritischen Bemerkungen zum Sañkhapāla-Jātaka)” in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, Vol. XXXIV (1990), pp. 79–106. Translated by Marianne Rankin.

Prof. Oskar von Hinüber (O.v.H.) not only offered valuable comments on an earlier version of this essay, but was also kind enough to make two Thai manuscripts available to me. For this I am most grateful to him and to the Social Research Institute of the University of Chiang Mai. I would also like to thank my friend Dr Chlodwig H. Werba (Ch.W.) for all his advice and suggestions for improvement. In the following, arabic numerals refer to the gāthās of the Campeyya Jātaka according to the Fausbøll edition, roman numerals to those gāthās which according to our investigation belong to the original version of the Campeyya Jātaka.

<sup>1</sup>These are composed of between twenty-four and thirty-one gāthās. The Sivi Jātaka has thirty-one gāthās (twenty-three ślokas and eight triṣṭubh/jagatī). Alsdorf, who has worked on this Jātaka, came to the conclusion that “there are *two* treatments of this popular narrative: one in tr./jag. and one in ślokas, and the editors of the Jātaka Book — or even an earlier poet — combined these two versions into *one*” (Alsdorf 1968b, p. 478 (= *Kl. Sch.* p. 364)). Apart from this Jātaka, only the Mahāpalobhana Jātaka (no. 507) has more than twenty-nine gāthās (thirty gāthās). But there, several gāthās give the impression of being later additions (see gāthās 1–4 and 6), so that one can start with the assumption that originally this Jātaka was also correctly incorporated into the Vīsati Nipāta.

is quite corrupt and comprises forty-six verses.<sup>2</sup> For this the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka (Ja V 161–77),<sup>3</sup> which has various gāthās in common with the Campeyya Jātaka,<sup>4</sup> will frequently be considered. The prose text (Ja IV.456.27f.) explicitly refers to it,<sup>5</sup> which should be particularly interesting for the history of the text.

The content of the Campeyya Jātaka tale is briefly as follows:<sup>6</sup> A nāga [named Campeyya, who has left his underwater dwelling in order to keep the uposatha on a termite mound] allows himself to be caught [by a snake charmer (*ahigunṭhika*)] without any resistance, in order not to break his uposatha vow. [By means of sorcery, the snake charmer makes the nāga perform tricks in front of paying spectators. At first he had intended to let the nāga go free as soon as he earned 1,000 pieces of gold in this way. But instead, tempted by the possibility of making easy money, he goes to Benares to the court of King Uggasena. Sumanā, the wife of the nāga, is very worried by the lengthy absence of her husband. When she finds out that the nāga has been captured by a snake charmer,

<sup>2</sup>The following twenty-two verses (gāthās of the Jātaka numbered according to Fausbøll) correspond as follows: Ja gāthā 1 = Mvu II 181,5\*–8\*; 2 = 181,10\*–11\*; 3 = 181,13\*–16\*; 4 = 181,18\*–21\*; 5 b/d = 182,9\*/6\*; 6 = 182,1\*–4\*; 7ab = 182,11\*–12\*; 8 = 183,12\*–13\*; 9 = 183,2\*–5\*; 10 = 183,7\*–10\*; 11/12ab = 183,15\*–17\*; 13ab = 183,19\*–20\*; 14 = 184,1\*–3\*; 15a = 184,18\*; 15d = 185,9\*; 16 = 185,3\*–6\*; 19ab = 184,15\*–16\*; 19cd ≠ 184,6\*–8\*; 20ab = 184,10\*–11\*; 20d = 184,13\* (185,2\*); 23 = 185,11\*–14\*; 24 = 186,1\*–4\*; 30f = 187,23\*; 31ac = 187,20\*–21\*; 36cd = 188,1\*–2\*; 39 = 188,2\*–5\*; 43 = 187,11\*–14\*.

<sup>3</sup>A list of suggestions for correction of the text of this Jātaka, which is corrupt in many places, is printed in an appendix to this article.

<sup>4</sup>Noted by Alsdorf 1977, p. 30, n. 21 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 790 n. 21).

<sup>5</sup>It also refers to the Bhūridatta Jātaka, with which the Campeyya Jātaka has g. 37a (= Ja VI 171,3\*) and g. 31a (= Ja VI 171,7\*) in common. That this is worthy of note is also shown by the Culladhammapāla Jātaka (Ja III 177–82), which is a “clumsy, coarse imitation of the Kṣāntivādīj (named in the prose story)” (Alsdorf 1968a, p. 266).

<sup>6</sup>Parts of the story which come from the prose text are set in square brackets. A detailed table of contents is to be found in Vogel 1926, pp. 151–53 (reference from O.v.H.). A complete translation is to be found in Grünwedel 1897, pp. 83–89.

she goes to Benares and arrives in the middle of the performance at court.] She begs the king to ransom her husband. But the word of the king is all that is required for the snake charmer to set the nāga free. In gratitude, the nāga asks permission to show the king his underwater palaces, and repeatedly swears that he has no evil intentions toward his rescuer. Eventually the king agrees and, accompanied by the nāga, visits his dwelling place. Amazed at the splendour, the king wants to know why the nāga keeps uposatha. He explains that it is only as a human that he would have the chance to escape the cycle of samsāra. Showered with gifts, the king returns to the human world.

The text of the Campeyya Jātaka, as we have it, is a mixture of 34½ triṣṭubhs and 9½ ślokas. Now Alsdorf, in his various masterly studies of individual Jātakas, repeatedly worked out the relationship between these two metres and showed that when triṣṭubh and śloka verses appear together, it is usually the śloka gāthās which have been added subsequently.<sup>7</sup> Thus, in the case of the Campeyya Jātaka, the śloka gāthās will be examined first with regard to their place in the original gāthā collection of the Jātaka.<sup>8</sup>

The Jātaka opens with two śloka gāthās<sup>9</sup> of which some single pādas have parallels in other Jātakas (“floating pādas”). So 1ab (*kā nu*

<sup>7</sup>“There can certainly be no question of the śloka as such being more recent than ... [the] tr[iṣṭubh], so that any śloka should be regarded as later than any tr. because of its metre; but the śloka remains ‘modern’, and it becomes the most common metre, as the tr. becomes less fashionable, so that it finds ... a role as successor to the tr.” (Alsdorf 1971, pp. 29f. (= *Kl. Sch.* pp. 386f.)). Cf. Alsdorf 1968b, p. 478 (= *Kl. Sch.* p. 364) and Sakamoto-Goto 1984, pp. 46 and 64, n. 58.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. also Alsdorf 1957a, p. 202 (*Kl. Sch.*, p. 186): “The bulk of both these texts consists of triṣṭubh verses, and it might be worthwhile to examine at the outset all the non-triṣṭubh stanzas with a view to ascertaining whether they are ‘original’ or whether there are grounds to justify the natural suspicion that they are secondary additions.”

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Mvu II 181,5\*, 8\*, 10\*–11\*: *kā nu vidyud ivābhāsi \*usarā viya tārakā* ... *devī asi vā gandharvī na tvām asi hi mānuṣī* || *nāham devī na gandharvī na mahārāja mānuṣī* || *nāgakanyāhaṇ bhadran te \*arthinī iha āgatā* ||. According

*vijju-r-ivābhāsi osadhī viya tārakā*<sup>10</sup> is found in the Alambusā Jātaka (Ja V 155.16\*), which is completely composed in ślokas.<sup>11</sup> Gāthā 1c (*devatā nu si gandhabbi*), has parallels in Ja V 260.5\*, 317.4\*, VI 13.13\* (*devatā nu si gandhabbo*), where each time the answer given in 2a (*n'amhi devo na gandhabbo*) also follows (Ja V 260.7\*, 317.8\*; VI 13.16\*).

These two ślokas are clearly an example of the tendency of the Jātaka redactors to clarify exactly who is speaking or acting and to explain their motives. This led, probably before the addition of the two ślokas, to gāthā 3 having another triṣṭubh<sup>12</sup> inserted, which undoubtedly

to Senart's text, the Mvu reads *sarasi viya tārakāḥ*. Lüders (1954: §83) based on Senart's mss reconstructs the "basic text" of the Mahāvastu as *osalī viya tālakā* (> *usalā viya tālakā* > *usarā viya tārakā* (thus mss BC II 181.5\*; the "visarga" of *tārakāḥ* is merely a punctuation mark)), where *osalī* corresponds to Skt. *ausarī*; *osalī tālakā*, that is, "the morning star". Earlier, Charpentier (1909, p. 35) read *usarā viya tārakāḥ* with mss BC. Moreover, he conjectured that Mvu II 181.8\* should read *na tvām manyāmi mānuṣīm*, for which he refers to mss BC (*na te anyāni mā*°). For the conjecture \**arthinī* instead of *avīcī* as transmitted, cf. Jones 1952, p. 175, n. 7.

<sup>10</sup>The first pāda is closely connected with the prose story. For there it is said that the nāga's wife, searching for her husband, appears at the king's court floating in the air (*ākāse ... aṭṭhāsi*, Ja IV 459.8). The comparison of the nāgī with a bright flash of lightning presumably gave rise to this passage in the story.

<sup>11</sup>It is interesting that, only a few gāthās earlier (and also in the Alambusā Jātaka (V 154.19\*)), the characterization of a person as *uggateja* is found (cf. Campeyya Jātaka, g. 4). Moreover, Alambusā Jātaka 14d (*āmuttamāṇi-kuṇḍalā*) may be compared with Campeyya Jātaka, g. 8b. Further Jātaka instances of the comparison [*kā nu vijju-r-ivābhāsi*] *osadhī viya tārakā* are recorded by Lüders 1954, §83.

<sup>12</sup>*vibbhantacittā kupitindriyāsi, nettehi te vārīganā savanti | kin te naṭṭham kiṁ pana patthayānā, idhāgatā nāri tad īngha brūhi* ||. Cf. Mvu II 181.13\*-16\*: \**vibhrāntacittā vilutendriyāsi, netrehi te vāri śravanti kin te | naṣṭam hi kiṁci abhiprārthayantī, ihāgatā \*dāni na dīrgham brūhi* || (Senart 1890: pāda a *citrāntacittā* [see Edgerton 1953 s.v. *viluta*; on the confusion of *c/v* and *t/bh* in Nepalese manuscripts see Regamey 1954, p. 517; cf. Charpentier 1909, p. 36], pāda d *tāni*).

originated in the Sattubhasta Jātaka (no. 402).<sup>13</sup> Gāthās 2d, 3cd and 11–12ab may be compared with the almost literally identical gāthās 1–3 of the Junha Jātaka (Ja IV 97.8\*-28\*).

The reason for the nāga wife's trust as she turns to the king with her request is explained in śloka gāthā 8, the first pāda of which has a parallel in Ja IV 320.8\*, and the second pāda of which was a very popular set piece (see note 11 and CPD under *āmutta-*; both together as pādas a and d in Ja V 259.15\*-16\*: *solasitthisahassāni sabbālamkārabhūsīta | vicitrāhatthābharaṇā āmuttamāṇikuṇḍalā* ||).<sup>14</sup>

In the 1½ ślokas 11–12ab the type and amount of the "ransom" to be offered for the freedom of the nāga are presented in more detail than in gāthā 9.<sup>15</sup> These verses come from the Rohantamiga Jātaka, which is

<sup>13</sup>The gāthā appears (with masculine forms) in the Sattubhasta Jātaka (Ja III 344.19\*-22\*), where pāda d however reads *idhāgamā brahme tad īngha brūhi*. The Sattubhasta Jātaka has eight gāthās but is in the Satta-nipāta, so it originally comprised only seven gāthās. It is definitely gāthā 5 (Ja III 348.2\*-5\*) which was added later. The first gāthā (*vibbhantacitto ...*) thus belongs to the original Sattubhasta Jātaka and may have been taken into the Campeyya Jātaka from there.

<sup>14</sup>*solas'-itthisahassāni āmuttamāṇikuṇḍalā | vārīgehāsayā nārīyo [nārī] tā pi tam saraṇam gatā* || (8<sup>a</sup>: S °*itthī*° ; 8<sup>c</sup>: S<sup>a</sup> *vārīgehe sayā nārī*, L 1471 *nārī*, CB S<sup>p</sup> °*gehasayā nārī*). — Mvu II 183.12\*f.: *śoḍāśa strīsaḥasrāṇī āmukta-māṇikuṇḍalā | vārīvāsagrāśritā nārīyo tvām śaraṇam \*gatā* || (Senart 1890: *ārya tvām śaraṇāgatā*; to be corrected with ms B (Charpentier 1909, p. 38)). The prose text of the Mvu version also recounts that the senior wife of the nāga appears at the court of King Ugrasena in Benares accompanied by 16,000 women (Mvu II 178.18–20).

<sup>15</sup>*dammi nikhasatam ludda thullañ ca maṇikuṇḍalam | catussadañ ca pallañkam ummāpupphasirinnibham* || 11 || *dve ca sādisiyo bharīyā usabhañ ca gavam satam | ossaṭṭhakāyo urago carātu, puññāththiko muccatu bandhanasmā* || 12 || (11b: BS *thūlañ*; 11c: S *caturassañ ca*, B *umāpupphasirinnibham*, S *ummārapupphasannibham*; 12d: ESB L 1471 *muñcatu*, C *muccatu*). — Mvu II 183.15\*-17\*: *demi niṣkaṣatam lubdha sthūlā ca maṇikuṇḍalā | catuḥśatam ca paryākam dāmakapuṣpasannibham | bhāryām ca sadrśīdevīm macyatu uragādhipah* || (Senart 1890t: pāda a: *labdhām*; pāda c: Charpentier 1909, p. 39, reads *catuḥsadañ ca*; Jones 1952, p. 177, n. 3, \**catutsada* (< *catuḥsada*; cf. Pāli *cat-ussada-* "four-cornered"). Whether this translation of \**catutsada*- is correct, however, is questionable, as the

composed entirely in ślokas (Ja IV 422,4\*-6\*). Two triṣṭubh pādas 12 cd (= 9cd = 10cd = 13cd), repeated once again, complete these gāthās.

For the textual criticism of śloka gāthā 14<sup>16</sup> it is sufficient to refer to Alsdorf's observation, "[an] example, so frequently observed in the Jātaka, of the gradual versification of parts of the story originally left in prose (in particular indications of who is speaking)."<sup>17</sup> Moreover, pādas cde = Ja VI 82,3\*/5\* (cf. 88,25\*).

Finally, śloka gāthās 25–28 merely bring forward the older description of the palace composed in triṣṭubhs (see below, gāthās 30–35). In content and choice of words, they are so exactly modelled on the following triṣṭubh gāthās 30–35 that there can hardly be doubt about their secondary nature.

A peculiarity common to gāthās 14 and 25–28 is the citation of names (Kāsirājan, Kāsivaddhāna,<sup>18</sup> Campeyya<sup>19</sup>) which also includes

adjective *catussada-* at Ja IV 309,26\* is an epithet of *grāma-* (*catussadām grāmavaram samiddham*). In Āryaśūra's Jātakamālā the corresponding verse is *catuhśatam grāmavaram samyddham* (113,8\*), which shows that the word was apparently no longer understood very early on (see also Kern 1891, p. 247; Speyer 1895, p. 160, n. 2).

<sup>16</sup> *mutto campeyyako nāgo rājānam etad-abravi | namo te kāsirāj' atthu namo te kāsivaddhāna | añjalin te pagāñhāmi passeyyam me nivesanam* || (of note is *passeyyam*, which in fact means "I would like to see". Read \**passedam* ("See this palace of mine"); I wish to thank Prof. A. Wezler for suggesting this conjectured reading). Cf. Mvu II 184,1\*-3\*; *mukto campako nāgo kāsirājānam bhāsatī* [prose] | *namo te kāśinām rāja namo te kāśivardhāna | añjalin te pragṛhāmī paśya rāja mo nivesanam* || (Is the prose line Mvu II 184,1 to be corrected to a śloka: *mukto \*campeyyako nāgo*? Or is this a case where "the prose of the Mahāvastu adapts the hieratic form of words to a *vr̥tagandhi*" (Smith 1953, p. 121)? Manuscript L 1471 of the Pāli Jātaka also often reads "Campaka" (g. 26b, 27d, 28b)).

<sup>17</sup> Alsdorf 1971, p. 29 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 386). Cf. Oldenberg 1918, p. 440 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 1080).

<sup>18</sup> 25b: SB L 1471 °*vaddhāno*, EC °*vaddhāno*.

<sup>19</sup> Manuscript L 1471 in g. 26–28 always reads "Campaka" (see n. 16). Mvu also offers this form of the name, but only in the prose (e.g. Mvu II 177,14, 184,1). The title of the (Campeyya) Jātaka is referred to at Ja I 45,20 (*tathā ... campeyyanāgarājakāle ... sīlapāramitāya pūritattabhbhāvānam parimāṇam*

gāthās 24<sup>20</sup> (Uggasena<sup>21</sup>) and 29 (Kāsirājan), but differentiates all these gāthās from those of the original Jātaka. That the king who frees the captured nāga is the King of Kāsī seems to be picked out of the last gāthā by the redactor (*bārāṇasim nagaram iddhaphitam, rajañ ca kārehi ...*). Where the name Campeyya (gāthās 26–28) or Campeyyaka (gāthās 14 and 30) comes from, I cannot say. The composer of the prose, however, derives the name by adding the suffix *-eyya*<sup>22</sup> to the name of the River Campā,<sup>23</sup> where according to the prose (Ja IV 454,11f.) the dwelling place of the nāga is to be found. These facts seem to come merely from the wish of the prose writer to localize the story and to give the main characters names.

It may be said with some degree of certainty that the 9½ śloka gāthās and triṣṭubh gāthās 3, 12cd, 24, and 29 were not among the

*nāma natthi*) and Papañcasūdanī II 617 (C<sup>e</sup> = Ps (E<sup>e</sup>) III 91,2 (Malalasekera 1937, p. 857). I would simply like to add the reference at Vism Chapter 9, § 33 (*campeyyo pi nāgarājā hutvā ahitunḍikena vihethiyamāno manopadosamattam pi na uppādesi | yathāha ...* (Cariyāpiṭaka 85–86)). Lüders has shown (1941, pp. 136ff.), that the titles in the Jātaka collection are recent and partly based on a misunderstanding of the text (cf. also particularly Mehendale 1970, pp. 125–29).

<sup>20</sup> *bherīmutīñgā pañavā ca sañkhā, \*āvajjum [/ \*avajjim̄su] uggasenassa rāñño | pāyāsi rājā bahu sobhamāno, purakkhato nārigañassa majhe* || (24b: E *āvajjayim̄su*, B *avajjayim̄su*, C *āvajjisuṁ*, C<sup>k</sup>s S L 1471 *āvajjim̄su*, Nālanda *avajjayim̄su*, S *uggasenarañño*). Cf. Mvu II 186,1\*-4\*: *bherī mṛdañgā pañahāś ca sañkhā, vādyensu veñū ugrasenarājño | niryāti rājā mahatā balena, puraskrto nārigañasya madhye* || and Harivamśa 94,14: *vasudevam puraskṛtya bherīsañkharavaiḥ saha | ugraseno yayau rājā vāsudevani-veśanam* || — The verb forms *\*āvajjum*, *āvajjim̄su* (forms with ā° are most probably wrong readings) and *avajjayim̄su*, which CPD does not refer to (under *āvajj°* (so g. 24a in E)), are aorists of the passive of the causative *vādeti* (*avajjiyim̄su* (so read) seems to be a double passive (on which see von Hinüber 2001, § 458): *vādya° > vajja° → avajj-iy-im̄su*).

<sup>21</sup> Otherwise only referred to in the prose (Ja IV 458,13, 467,23, 468,22; cf. Mvu II 177,9, 178,19f., 179,6). The Harivamśa passage 94,14., cited in the preceding footnote, may be compared in particular.

<sup>22</sup> By intensification (von Hinüber 2001, § 213) from Old Indic *-eya-*.

<sup>23</sup> Malalasekera (1937, p. 857) under "4 Campā" notes only this passage.

original gāthās of the Jātaka. None of these verses is necessary for the development of the story told in the Campeyya Jātaka. They depict more fully certain details which were only sketched in the original Jātaka (gāthās 1–3, worry and grief of the nāga wife); they explain other points (gāthā 8, the nāga wife finds refuge with the king; gāthās 11, 12, ransom money; 25–29, description of the palace); indicate who is speaking (gāthās 14, 30ab), or give the story a local, personal setting (gāthās 24, 29). If they are left out, a cogent plot remains, free of unnecessary repetition.

In the fourth gāthā there is a verse which fulfils all the requirements of the first gāthā of a Jātaka. Apart from the general introduction of the theme (“The Capture of the Nāga”), the identity of the speaker (the wife of the nāga) and her motives (a plea for the release of the nāga) are clearly indicated.

I-4      *yam uggatejo urago ti cāhu, nāgo ti tam āha janinda |*  
*tam aggahī puriso jīvikattho, tam bandhanā muñca patī mam' eso ||<sup>24</sup>*

The one who is also (*ca*) called the snake of powerful energy, the people call nāga, O king. He was caught by a man who is making a living from him. Release him from captivity. He is my husband.

The characterization of the nāga as *uggateja*- elicits a question from the king which is posed in similar form in gāthā 34 of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka (5b = Ja V 172,16\*), where the snake had earlier been described

<sup>24</sup>4b: ES<sup>P</sup> *āhu janō* (S<sup>a</sup> (*āhu*) *manussaloke* instead of *janō janinda*; cf. Ja V 137,27\* *maghavā ti nam āhu manussaloke*), L 1471 *āha janō*, C B *āhu janā*. Cf. Mvu II 181,19\* *nāgo ti nam āhu janā janendra*. E S<sup>P</sup> *āhu janō* may be compared with Ja VI 336,17\* (*alikam bhāsatī [yam] dhutī saccam āhu mahallikā* || (grammatical cty.: *āhū ti āha katheti* | *ayam eva vā-pātho*)) where the singular in pāda 1 suggests that the same be assumed in pāda 2 as well. Cf. Norman 1969, p. 136, on Th 57, *ayam āhu purānyā kuṭi* (see CPD s.v. *āha* (“wrongly taken = ahosi, Th-a”)); on a similar case in the Mahāvastu (Mvu II 96,5\*: *te dāni r̄sayo ... rājānam ... uvāca*) cf. Leumann and Watanabe 1970, p. 79, n. 638.

as *mahānubhāva*- “of great power” and *tejassin*- “possessing fiery power”.<sup>25</sup>

II-5      *kathamp nvayam balaviriyūpapanno, hatthattham āgañchi vanibbakassa |*  
*akkhāhi me nāgakaññe tam attham, katham vijānemu gahītanāgam* ||<sup>26</sup>

How then did this creature endowed with strength and power fall into the hands<sup>27</sup> of a beggar?<sup>28</sup> Tell me that, nāga girl. How could I have recognized [him] as a captured nāga?<sup>29</sup>

The answer to this question gives a motive, which, as Alsdorf showed (1977, p. 29f. = *Kl. Sch.*, pp. 789f.), is repeated in various nāga Jātakas, including the Sañkhapāla Jātaka (gāthā 37). As “venerator of the Dhamma of the Righteous” the nāga was keeping the uposatha on a

<sup>25</sup> *appānubhāvā tam mahānubhāvam, tejassinam hanti atejavanto* | *kim-eva dāthāvudha kim paṭicca, hatthattham āgañchi vanibbakānam* || (see below, “Remarks on the text of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka”, ad g. 34c).

<sup>26</sup>5b: SB *āgacchi*, C *vanibbakassa*. — 5c: Should the words be separated as *nāgakaññ'* *etam-attham*? Cf. also g. 38c *nāgarāje tam attham* (= Sañkhapāla Jātaka 28c, 30c, 42c (see below, “Remarks on the text of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka”, ad g. 28c). — Mvu II 182,6\*-9\*: *katham vijāneya grhītanāgo, sa ugratejo balasthānavanto* | *durāsado duhprasaho bhujāgo, hastatvam āgacche vanīpaka* ||.

<sup>27</sup> Compare Edgerton 1953b s.v. *hastatva*- for the expression *hatthattham gacchati* (and similar expressions at Ja I 244,10\*, III 204,19\*, and VI 318,23\*). He also gives a reference to CPD <sup>2</sup>*attha*- 2., where Sinhalese *-ata* is compared, citing Geiger, *Litt. u. Spr. der Singh.*, § 40B. With Pāli *hatthattham gacchati* cf. AMg. *hatthajjam āgayā*, Utt XIV 45 — another example of “the craving for distinctiveness of Jainas and Buddhists in regard to their terminology” (Meyer, *Hindu Tales*, pp. 111–12, n. 3).

<sup>28</sup> See Alsdorf 1977, p. 33, n. 36 (*Kl. Sch.*, p. 793, n. 36), and Edgerton 1953b s.v. *vanīpaka*- “beggar”. According to the prose version of this Pāli Jātaka, this should be translated as “showman” (O.v.H.).

<sup>29</sup> Attention should be paid to the syntax of the compound. Cf. Senart’s note to the Mvu text (Senart 1890, p. 530): “How can one believe that ...”. As for *grhītanāgo*, judging by *nigrhītanāgo*, line 4 on the following page, *grhīta* is to be understood literally in the sense of *nigrhīta*: ‘who has suppressed the nāga’, that is, ‘who has concealed his strength and appearance as a nāga’”.

termite mound (according to the prose version, 460,20),<sup>30</sup> where he was eventually taken captive.<sup>31</sup>

III-6 *nagaram pi nāgo bhasmam kareyya, tathā hi so balaviriyūpapanno | dhammañ ca nāgo apacāyamāno, tasmā parakkamma tapo karoti ||*<sup>32</sup>

The nāga could reduce a [whole] town to ashes, he is so strong and powerful; but out of reverence for the Dhamma he resolutely practises tapas.<sup>33</sup>

IV-7 *cātuddasim paññarasiñ ca rāja, catuppathe sammati nāgarājā | tam aggahī puriso jīvikattho, tam bandhanā muñca patī mam' eso ||*<sup>34</sup>

On the fourteenth and fifteenth [days<sup>35</sup> of the half-month] the nāga king stayed at a crossroads, O king. There he was captured by a man, who is [thus] earning his living. Release him from captivity. He is my husband.

In the following gāthā the wife of the nāgā expresses her plea for the release of her husband from captivity and for him to be treated without violence — to match the nāgā's own behaviour.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Ja IV 330,3\*-6\*, *anujagāmī uraga (d)dujivha, dāthāvudho ghoraviso si sappa | khudam pipāsam adhivāsayanto, kasmā bhavam posathiko nu dīgho*, and Ja VI 174,32\*, *uposatham upavasanto semi vammikamuddhani* (cf. Alsdorf 1977, p. 29 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 789)).

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Ja V 172,25\*-28\*, *cātuddasim \*pannarasiñ c'alāra, uposatham niccam-upavasāmi | athāgamum soñasa bhojaputtā, rājum gahetvāna dalhañ ca pāsam ||*

<sup>32</sup>6a: *nagaram pi* (˘ – ˘); see Smith 1949, p. 1151. Pāda d = 36d (= Ja V 173,12\*). Mvu II 18,1\*-4\*: *nagaram pi nāgo bhasmikareyā, tathā hi yāvac ca balopapeto | dharmam tu nāgo \*apacāyamāno, hastatvam āgacche vanīpakasya ||*; Senart 1890, pāda c: *ayañ yācamāno* (cf. Charpentier 1909, p. 37, and Jones 1952, p. 176, n. 2).

<sup>33</sup>For the translation cf. Alsdorf 1977, p. 33 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 793).

<sup>34</sup>7a: E *pannarasiñ ca*, S<sup>a</sup> *cātuddasī paññarasiñ ca rājā*, S<sup>p</sup> C *pannarasiñ ca*, B L 1471 *pañcadasim* (cf. on this vo Hinüber 2001, § 402). Cf. Mvu II 182,11\*-14\*: *caturdaśīm pañcadaśīm ca aṣṭamīm, catuspate gacchatī nāgarājō | osrṣṭakāyo vicaranto nāgo, hastatvam āgacche vanīpakasya ||* (cf. Thī 31 cātuddasī pañcadasī yā ca/va pakkhassa aṭṭhamī with pāda a).

<sup>35</sup>Here, the day is surely meant (cf. *uposathadivasa*-) because the laity keep the uposatha during the day by fasting, etc.

V-9 *dhammena mocehi asāhasena, gāmena nikkhena gavam satena | ossaṭṭhakāyo urago carātu, puññaththiko muccatu bandhanasmā ||*<sup>36</sup>

In accordance with the Dhamma, release him without violence by means of [the gift of] a village, gold jewellery [or] of a hundred cows. The snake should leave, having lowered his body.<sup>37</sup> He who [after all only] wanted to gain merit, should be released from captivity.

In the next gāthā (VI-10) the king agrees to this request in the same words (a principle of “oral poetry”).<sup>38</sup> As indicated above, both the following verses (11, 12) were added later only to give more details of the extent of the ransom.

VII-13 *vināpi dānā tava vacanam janinda,*

*muñcemu nañ uragam bandhanasmā | ossaṭṭhakāyo urago carātu, puññaththiko muccatu bandhanasmā ||*<sup>39</sup>

Even without a gift, O king, we will release this snake from captivity on the strength of your word.<sup>40</sup> ...

<sup>36</sup>9d: E SB L 1471 *muñcatu*, C *muccatu*. Cf. Mvu II 183,2\*-5\*: *dharmeṇa mocehi asāhasena, grāmeṇa niṣkena ca gośatena | osrṣṭakāyo nigrhītanāgo, punyārththiko macyatu nāgarājō ||*

<sup>37</sup>*ossaṭṭhakāya-* seems to denote the non-aggressive posture of snakes which have “lowered their bodies”. As a peaceful attitude is appropriate for someone practising the *uposatha*, snakes are described thus when celebrating this day (cf. S III 241,15: *ko nu kho bhante hetu ko paccayo yena-m-idh’ ekacce aṇḍajā nāgā uposatham upavasanti ossaṭṭhakāyā ca bhavantī ti*). I am indebted to Prof. Dr Albrecht Wezler for this explanation.

<sup>38</sup>Here too read *muccatu* with C (E SB L 1471 *muñcatu*). Mvu II 183,7\*-10\*: ... *moceṣyam, ... | osrṣṭakāyo ca bhujamgo gacchatu, pṛito ca sampadyatu nāgarājā ||*

<sup>39</sup>13a: hypermetric pāda, in view of L 1471 *vināpi dānena tava* and C<sup>k</sup> *tha* for *tava* perhaps read *vināpi dānā te vacanam janinda* (˘ – ˘ – – | – ˘ ˘ | – ˘ – ˘), typically hypermetric because of the deferred cæsura (O.v.H.). 13b: S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *muñcemi*; 13d: C *muccatu*, E SB L 1471 *muñcatu*. — Mvu II 183,19\*-22\*: *vinā tu dānā vacanān narendra, muñcām’ imāñ dhārmiko nāgarājā | mahānubhāvo paralokadarśī, mahābalo so ca na samvihēṭhyo ||*

<sup>40</sup>Cf. Alsdorf 1977, p. 30, n. 23 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 790, n. 23): “*vinā pi dānā tava vacanam nar’ inda* (g. 13): according to Mvu II 183,19\* *vinā tu dānā vacanān narendra*, ECSB *vacanam* is to be corrected to *nā* (or abl. -*am*?”) For the

It emerges clearly from gāthā 15 that on his release, the snake invites the king to visit his underwater palaces, whereupon the king takes pause for thought, explaining that a man should not in fact trust a snake. This in turn leads the snake to protest his sincerity in two verses, the first of which appears verbatim in the Mahāsutasoma Jātaka (Ja V 480,15\*-18\*). The gāthā is thus correctly placed before the two verses of protestation and belongs to the original content of the Jātaka.

VIII-15 addhā hi dubbissāsam etam āhu, yam mānuso vissase amānusamhi |  
sace ca manū yācasi etam attham, dakkhemu te nāga nivesanāni ||<sup>41</sup>

In fact they call it misplaced trust for a human to trust a non-human. But if you ask me [now] for that, O nāga, I shall [come with you to] see your dwellings.

As gāthā 18 it comes after the two gāthās of oath, repeated for emphasis.<sup>42</sup>

IX-16 sace pi vāto girim āvaheyya, cando ca surīyo ca chamā pateyyum |  
sabbā ca najjo paṭisotam vajeyyum  
na tv-ev' aham rāja musā bhaṇeyyam ||<sup>43</sup>

ablative singular in *-am* cf. Sakamoto-Goto 1984, p. 52, n. 32, vo Hinüber 2001, § 304, and Oberlies 2001, p. 144.

<sup>41</sup> 15a: E CB S<sup>p</sup> *dubbissāsam*, S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *dubbissāsam* (cf. PED s.v. *vissāsa*-) (so also 18a). 15b: all mss = E *amānusamhi* (to remove the hypermetric syllable, perhaps read *vissase* 'mānusamhi' (suggestion of Ch.W., who furthermore referred me to Rgveda 10.95.8b on the subject of the comparison "human/beast").

<sup>42</sup> Indeed, the Siamese edition of the Jātaka-athavaṇṇanā of A.B. 2471 (1928) does not give this stanza.

<sup>43</sup> 16a: EC *sace hi*, B B<sup>d</sup> (Fausbøll) S L 1471 *pi* (cf. Mahāsutasoma Jātaka g. 35a (Ja V 480,15\*): *sace pi vāto ...* (cited at Saddanīti 815,6) and Mvu II 185,3\*-6\*: *apy eva vāto girim āvaheya, cando ca surīyo ca ksitīm pateya | sarvā ca nadyo pratiśrotā vahensuḥ, na tv ev' aham rāja mṛṣā bhaṇeyam ||*). 16d: S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *tv-evāham*.

Even if the wind were to carry off a mountain, sun and moon were to fall to earth, and all rivers run backwards, I would not, O king, tell an untruth.<sup>44</sup>

X-17 nabham phaleyya udadhī pi susse, samvattaye bhūtadharā vasundharā |  
siluccayo meru samūlam ubbahe,  
na tv-ev' aham rāja musā bhaṇeyyam ||<sup>45</sup>

The sky could burst, the ocean dry up, the creature-carrying earth could coil itself up [and] Mount Meru rip out its own roots,<sup>46</sup> but I, O king, would not tell an untruth.

As regards verses 19–22, there is no doubt that they belong to the old gāthā content of the Jātaka. They build up a picture of the risk which a visit to a nāga represents and show the nāga and his kin as true "venerators of the Dhamma of the Righteous", grateful and true to their word.

XI-19 tumhe kho cettha ghoravisā ulārā, mahātejā khippakopā ca hotha |  
mama kāraṇā bandhanasmā pamutto, arahasi no jānitum ye katāni ||<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Compare Ja III 62,18\*f.: *ambho na kira saddheyyam yam vāto pabbatam vahē | pabbatam ca vahē vāto sabbam pi paṭhavim vahē* || "Who could ever believe that the wind | would lift a mountain from the earth? | And yet the wind would sooner carry | the mountain away, even the whole earth ||" (Lüders 1921, p. 218).

<sup>45</sup> 17b: EC *saṃvattayam* (read: *saṃvattī*) ayam "this [earth] could coil itself up" (?), S *saṃvatteyya*, L 1471 *saṃvatteyyūṇ* (corrected to *saṃvattaye* (read: *vattaye*)), B *saṃvattaye*; 17d: S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *tv-evāham*.

<sup>46</sup> I take *saṃūla* as Skt. *svaṃūla-*, following a suggestion of O.v.H. Pāli *ubbahati* ("tear out") comes from Old Indic *ud-vṛhati*, which survives in Prakrit *uvvihai* (cf. Pischel § 489) with the verbal adjective *uvvūḍha-* or *uvvīḍha-* (cf. Wackernagel 1937, p. 833 (= Kl. Sch., p. 415)). Cf. Ja V 240,23\* *saṃūlam api abbahe*. On the other hand, the commentary explains: *evam mahā-sinerupabbato saṃūlo utthāya purānapaṇṇam viya ākāse pakkhandeyya* (Ja IV 462,26f.), taking *saṃūla-* to be a bahuvrīhi (= *mūlena sahitāḥ*) and *ubbahe* = *udvahet* (cf. also CPD s.v.).

<sup>47</sup> 19a: BCS *tumhe khottha*, L 1471 *tumhe kho cettha* (read: *khō* (cf. Alsdorf 1968a, p. 59) or with Fausbøll *tumhe 'ttha kho*); EBCS<sup>p</sup> *°kopī*, S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *°kopā*; 19c: B *māṃkāraṇā* (Fausbøll's *mama kāraṇā* scans  $\ddot{\text{m}}\text{ā} - \text{mā} -$ ); 19d: L 1471 *arahātī* ( $\ddot{\text{m}}\text{ā} - \text{mā} -$ ), E L 1471 *jānitāye* (read *jānitāye*), C *jānitāye*, C<sup>ks</sup>

You are indeed large, terribly poisonous and of great brilliance; you are also quick to anger.<sup>48</sup> Through me you have been freed from captivity. I expect you to be grateful to me.

XII-20 so paccatam̄ niraye ghorarūpe, mā kāyikam̄ sātam̄ alattha kiñci |  
peñāya baddho marañam̄ upetu, yo tādisam̄ kamma katañ na jāne ||<sup>49</sup>

Anyone not grateful for a deed done for him such as this should roast in a terrible hell,<sup>50</sup> should find no bodily comfort, should die imprisoned in a basket.

XIII-21 saccappaññā tava-m-esa hotu, akkodhano hohi anūpanāhī |  
sabbañ ca te nāgakulam̄ supaññā, aggim̄ va gimhāsu vivajjayantu ||<sup>51</sup>

Let this be your true promise. Be free from anger, not contentious. And all your nāga kin shall avoid the supaññas as [men] avoid fire in summer.

XIV-22 anukampasī nāgakulam̄ janinda, mātā yathā suppiyam̄ ekaputtam̄ |  
ahañ ca te nāgakulena saddhiñ, kāhāmi veyyāvatiñam̄ ulāram̄ ||<sup>52</sup>

jānitamye, B jānituye (to be explained as *jānitumye*), S jānitave (on these different infinitives see Oberlies 2001, pp. 263–64). Cf. Mvu II 184.5\*–8\*: [suduśkaram̄ nāga mayā kṛtam̄ te], duḥkhāsi tvam̄ bandhanād asi muktaḥ | jāto ca loke na kṛtāni jānati, mā khussa me nāga kṛtam̄ na jāne ||, and Mvu II 184.15\*–18\*: tuṁhe hi me tīkṣṇavīśā udārā, mahābalā kṣiprakopā ca nāgā | [nāgāham̄ etam̄ abhiśraddadhāmī], [no tvam̄ amanuśo manusasya kruddho] || (at Mvu II 184.18\* read amānuśo mānuśasya with mss BC (Charpentier 1909, p. 41)).

<sup>48</sup>Cf. Rāmāyaṇa 4.58.9b tīkṣṇakopā bhujāngamāḥ.

<sup>49</sup>Cf. Mvu II 184.10\*–13\*: narakasmim̄ jīveya ciram̄ sa \*kālam̄, mā kāyikam̄ kiñci labheya sādhu | yo bādhate †pūrvakārisya †rājan, asmādṛśo tuhya kṛtam̄ na jāne || Senart 1890: 17a, kāmam̄; 17c, pūrvakarisya rājño; cf. however mss BC (Charpentier 1909, p. 40; on †pūrvakārisya, cf. also Edgerton 1953b s.v. pūrvakārin-); 17d: yo tādṛśam̄ karma kṛtam̄ na jāne (cf. Jones 1952, p. 178, n. 2). Charpentier 1909, p. 40, restores pādas cd as follows: yo bādhito pūrvakārisya rājan, asmādṛśo tuhya kṛtam̄ na jāne || and translates: “who — bound to a former benefactor as I am to you, O king — is not grateful?”

<sup>50</sup>Cf. Ja VI 183.2\* paccati niraye ghore.

<sup>51</sup>21b: B anūpanāhī; 21d: S aggī va, B gimhesu.

<sup>52</sup>22a: BCS<sup>a</sup> anukampasī (≈ – – –)

You have pity on the nāga kin, O king, like a mother on her only son who is very dear to her. [Therefore,] the nāga kin and I will render you great service.<sup>53</sup>

After the king had satisfied himself as to the sincerity of the nāga, he gave the order to depart. Pāda d, which takes up 15d, argues against elimination of the verse, which must be taken into consideration because similar “instructions” are frequently interpolated by the revisers of the Jātakas.

XV-23 yojentu ve rājarathe sucitte, kambojake assatare sudante |  
nāge ca yojentu suvaññakappane, dakkhemu nāgassa nivesanāni ||<sup>54</sup>

The well-tamed mules from Kamboja should be harnessed to the lovely shining carriage of the king and [also] the elephants, decorated with golden bridles.<sup>55</sup> We wish to [go to] see the palaces of the nāga.

The following gāthās, which have in part been included verbatim in the Vimānavatthu,<sup>56</sup> give a typical description of the magnificent dwelling places of the nāgas.<sup>57</sup> In the course of transmission, the original description of the palace in triṣṭubhs had inserted before it a second description in ślokas, which, in part, verbally reflects the older

<sup>53</sup>On veyyāvatika- cf. Lüders 1954, § 99.

<sup>54</sup>23a: L 1471 yojantu rāja° (≈ – –); 23c: L 1471 suvaññakappake. Cf. Mvu II 185.11\*–14\*: yujyantu te rājarathā sucitrā, kambojakā aśvavarā sudāntā | hastī ca yujyantu suvaññacchatrā, draksyāmy aham nāganiveśanāni || Charpentier 1909, p. 41, corrected to \*aśvatarā. Cf. Ja IV 395.16\* yojentu ve rājarathe with pāda a of the Pāli text (cf. Alsdorf 1957a, p. 203 (= Kl. Sch., p. 187)).

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Ja IV 404.26\*–27\* (yutte deva rathe dehi ājānīye c'alamkate | nāge dehi mahārāja hemakappanavāsase), V 258.27\* (... mātaṅgā hemakappanavāsasā) and Skt. kalpanā- Amarakośa (NS Press) 1551, Daśakumāracarita (ed. M. R. Kāle) 59.7, Jātakamālā 74.9.

<sup>56</sup>Ja 30 ab ≠ Vv 17.1a; Ja 31a ≠ Vv 36.2a; Ja 31b ≠ Vv 64.13c; Ja 32a, 35a ≠ Vv 44.11ab; Ja 33ab = Vv 11.1ab; Ja 34ab = Vv 6.8cd, 8.8cd; Ja 35ab ≠ Vv 44.3cd, 84.32bc.

<sup>57</sup>Cf. Alsdorf 1971, pp. 53–55 (= Kl. Sch., pp. 410–12).

version.<sup>58</sup> The following 1½ triṣṭubhs (gāthās 29 and 30 ab) could not have belonged to the old gāthā collection either, if the grammar in the case of g. 29 is taken as the only criterion.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, as is so often found, 30ab merely puts into verse an indication of who is speaking (see above, p. 119).<sup>60</sup>

XVI-30 vimānaseṭṭhāni imāni tuyham, ādiccavāṇṇāni pabhassarāni |  
n' etādisam̄ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam̄ nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>61</sup>

These magnificent palaces of yours shine like the sun. There is nothing like this in the world of men. What [then] is your reason for practising asceticism, nāga ?

XVII-31 tā kambukāyūradharā suvatthā, (vatṭaṅgulī tambatalūpapannā)<sup>62</sup>  
paggayha pāyenti anomavaṇṇā |  
n' etādisam̄ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam̄ nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>63</sup>

These beautifully clad [nāga maidens] are wearing bracelets and armlets. (They have [beautiful] rounded fingers, copper-red palms and soles.) [These nāga maidens] of unparalleled beauty offer drinks with outstretched [arms]. There is nothing ...

<sup>58</sup>Cf. 26cd (ādiccavāṇṇupanibham kāmsavijjupabhassaram) with 30d (ādiccavāṇṇāni pabhassarāni).

<sup>59</sup>Gāthā 29 can only be translated if a type of “split compound” is assumed (see CPD Epileg. 33\* and Oberlies 2001, pp. 122–23): nāgakaññā ... gaṇena for \*nāgakaññāgaṇena; see also the explanation of the grammatical commentary Ja IV 465,9f. (read nāgakaññāgaṇena caritam with B<sup>d</sup>B<sup>a</sup>L 1471, or rather -kaññānam gaṇena caritam with C<sup>a</sup>S<sup>a</sup> (= Ja VI 313,19'–20')).

<sup>60</sup>The number of lines in a verse should not vary either in a strophic system of metre such as the Indian (Ch.W.).

<sup>61</sup>30f: B *kim patthayam*.

<sup>62</sup>Pāda b could easily be omitted (Ch.W.). Cf. footnote 60.

<sup>63</sup>31a: L 1471 suvāṇṇā; 31e: B *kim patthayam*. Cf. Mvu II 187,20\*–23\*: *tvaṁ kañcukāmbaradharo suvastro, tatra yāpento anupamavarṇo | divyehi kāmehi samāṅgibhūtaḥ, kimartham nāga bhūvi tvaṁ caresi ||* Cf., however, mss BC: °dharā suvastrā, [tatra] yāyanti anopavarṇṇā |.

XVIII-32 najo ca khemā puthulomamacchā, adāsakuntābhīrudā suttīthā |  
n' etādisam̄ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam̄ nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>64</sup>

And the rivers are quiet,<sup>65</sup> [the home of] broad-scaled fish. Their magnificent banks resound with birds living in freedom. There is nothing ...<sup>66</sup>

XIX-33 koñcā mayūrā diviyā ca hamṣā, vaggussarā kokilā sāmpatanti |  
n' etādisam̄ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam̄ nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>67</sup>

Cranes, peacocks and heavenly geese, sweet sounding cuckoos fly [around] together [there]. There is nothing ...<sup>68</sup>

XX-34 ambā ca sālā tilakā ca jambuyo, uddālakā pāṭaliyo ca phullā |  
n' etādisam̄ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam̄ nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>69</sup>

Mango, sal, *tilaka*, and roseapple trees, *uddālakas* and *pāṭalis* stand in full bloom. There is nothing ...<sup>70</sup>

XXI-35 imā ca te pokkharañño samantato,  
diviyā ca gandhā satataṁ \*sāmpavanti |

<sup>64</sup>32a: CS L 1471 *temā*, B *te 'mā*; 32b: S<sup>p</sup> L 1471 *ādāsakuntā°*, S<sup>a</sup> *ādāsasa-kuntā°* (cty: *ādāsasakuntābhīrudā ti ādāsasāṅkhātehi sakunēhi*), C *āṭā sakuntābhīrudā* (C<sup>a</sup> as one word; cty: *āṭāsaṅkhātehi sakunēhi abhīrudā*), B *āṭāsakuntā°* (cty: *āṭāsaṅkhātehi sakunēhi abhīrudā*) (the *āṭā* bird is named in the Vessantara Jātaka VI 539,13\* (cty: *dabbīmukhasakuna*) and Cone, under *adāsakuntābhīrudā* and *āṭā* is inclined to accept *āṭāsakuntābhīrudā* as the correct reading); 32d: B *kim patthayam*.

<sup>65</sup>Cf. Lüders 1897, pp. 118f., n. 5, where he refers to this passage (Ja IV 466,1\*). But in the transmission of the text, the inclusion of *khemā* is problematic. Should we perhaps read *temā* with BCS L 1471 and connect this with *temeti* (see PED s.v.)? Is the meaning: rivers “full of water”? (O.v.H.).

<sup>66</sup>CPD s.v. explains *adāsakunta-* as formed by haplology from \**adāsasakunta-*. The correctness of this explanation is doubtful, however, in view of the reading of BCSL (cf. footnote 64; cf. also Bollée 1970, pp. 89f.).

<sup>67</sup>33d: B *kim patthayam*.

<sup>68</sup>On *koñca-* “crane” see Leslie 1998. Cf. *mayūrakoñcābhīrudā*- Ja V 304,24\*, VI 483,3\* (cf. Alsdorf 1957b, p. 16 (*Kl. Sch.*, p. 285)) and D III 201,22.

<sup>69</sup>34a: *jagatī pāda* (cadence – ˘ – ˘ –); 34d: B *kim patthayam*.

<sup>70</sup>*pāṭalī* is the trumpet-flower tree, *Stereospermum suaveolens* (Cone and Gombrich 1977, p. 97, n. 2).

n' etādisaṁ atthi manussaloke, kimatthiyam nāga tapo karosi ||<sup>71</sup>

From all sides, heavenly scents always pervade these lotus pools of yours. There is nothing ...<sup>72</sup>

The following six gāthās (36–41) pose the most difficult textual problem of the Campeyya Jātaka. They are also found as gāthās 40–43 and 50–51 in the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka. Let us look at these gāthās individually.

The question posed six times, *kimatthiyam nāga tapo karosi?*, definitely requires an answer, so that either gāthā 36 or perhaps gāthā 39 must have followed gāthās 30–35. It is fairly certain that gāthā 38 of the Campeyya Jātaka has been borrowed from the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka, which is shown by the choice of words of this gāthā (cf. Saṅkhapāla Jātaka gg. 31b, 34c to *mahānubhāva-*; cf. Saṅkhapāla Jātaka g. 28c (see also 30c) to *pucchāmi tam nāgarāje tam attham*<sup>73</sup>). This implies that gāthā 39 also originates from the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka as a necessary answer to the question (*seyyo ito kena manussaloko?*) posed in gāthā 38. Thus

<sup>71</sup> 35a: *jagatī pāda °ñño* (S *pokkharaññā samantato* (– – – –), L 1471 *samantā* (triṣṭubh pāda – – –); 35b : EC *diviyā* (C *divyā*) *ca* (– – –) *gandhā satataṁ sampatanti* (*sampatanti* is from gāthā 33, where it is in the right place, and has been moved through *aberratio oculi* (*sampa-* twice)), S *dibyā ca* (– – –) ... *sampavāyanti* (L 1471 om. *ca*), B *dibbā ca gandhā satataṁ pavāyanti*; the commentary reads 35b: S<sup>a</sup> *dibyā gandhā ti* ... *dibyā gandhā pavāyanti*. EC<sup>a</sup> B<sup>a</sup> *dibbā ca gandhā ti* ... *dibbagandhā vāyanti*; 35d : B *kim patthayam*.

<sup>72</sup> The syntax of the gāthā causes difficulties. As *gandhā* is the subject (cf. Ja III 91,14\* *vāti cāyan tato gandho*, Ja III 189,14\* *vāti gandho timirānam*, and Mahābhārata 1,175,10 *gandho* ... *pravāyati*), *pokkharañño* must be the accusative dependent on *sampavanti*. Cf. Vv 84,32 (*dibbā ca gandhā surabhī pavanti* | *te sampavāyanti idam vimānam* ...) and Th 528 (*dumāni* ... *samantato sabbadisā pavanti*). But should it not mean “the lotus pools emit heavenly scents”? Should it read : *\*imāya te pokkharañño samantato*, “around this lotus pool of yours” (*samantato* with genitive)? Or *imā ca te pokkharañño samantato*, *\*diviye ca \*gandhe satataṁ [sam]pavanti* “these lotus pools of yours continually waft heavenly scents in all directions”? The grammatical commentary explains : *tāsu pokkharañsu satataṁ dibbagandhā vāyanti*.

<sup>73</sup> Perhaps *kāmehi* might be added as well (cf. Saṅkhapāla Jātaka g. 25d).

only gāthā 36 would remain as the “original” answer of the Campeyya Jātaka to the question posed in gg. 30–35.

But the question *kimatthiyam nāga tapo karosi* of gāthā 39 of the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka also requires an answer, so we find ourselves facing a similar textual historical problem there. The fact that the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka with its fifty-two triṣṭubhs<sup>74</sup> is placed in the Cattālisa-nipāta shows that, like the Campeyya Jātaka, it was extended by at least three gāthās during revision.

If we look at the last four gāthās of this Jātaka, then it seems clear to me that the original ended with gāthā 48, which answers the question posed in gāthā 1 (*katham nu vittāni pahāya bhoge, pabbaji ...*) in pāda d (*saddhāy*’ *aham pabbajito mhi rāja*). Gāthās 48cd and 49 also occur in the Theragāthā and Majjhima-nikāya, as follows:

gāthā 48b	Th 782d	M II 73,19, 20
gāthā 48c	Th 787c	M II 73,19, 20
gāthā 48c	Th 787d, 789a	M II 74,7f.
gāthā 49	Th 788	M II 74,9–12

Earlier, the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka probably ended with gāthā 48, pādas bcd of which belong to the large store of “floating pādas.”<sup>75</sup> Subsequently, the three gāthās 49–51 were added, praising Alāra’s decision to live as an ascetic by general maxims, while g. 49 came in naturally because it followed two pādas very similar to g. 48cd in the Majjhima-nikāya and Theragāthā.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>74</sup> In Fausbøll’s edition the Jātaka comprises only 51 gāthās. But apart from L 1550 (= E) all the oriental editions of the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka I have used (as well as Fausbøll’s manuscripts B<sup>ds</sup>) have an additional verse between gāthās 32 and 33 (see below p. 132).

<sup>75</sup> Apart from the parallel places mentioned, there are parallels for g. 48b at A IV 157,7 and M II 73,18f. (*asassatam vippariññāmadhammam*) and for g. 48c at Ja IV 313,1\* and Sn 50c.

<sup>76</sup> On the closing verses of the Jātaka, cf. Oldenberg 1918, pp. 432ff. (= Kl. Sch., pp. 1072ff.)

These considerations point to the conclusion that the composer of the “original” Campeyya Jātaka took gāthās 36–39 from the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka (gg. 40–43), which would by no means be unusual. It is a well-known fact that the Jātaka writers “sometimes, instead of practising original composition, were engaged in a kind of jigsaw puzzle”.<sup>77</sup>

Presumably, gāthās 40 and 41, commending the decision of the nāga (*kāhāmi jātimaraṇassa antam*),<sup>78</sup> also do not belong to the original Campeyya Jātaka. These are “floating stanzas” which were adapted to different contexts (cf. Ja III 306,15\*, 16\*, 22\*–25\*, IV 453,15\*, 16\*, V 478,22\*),<sup>79</sup> but they do not fit well here.

XXII–36 na puttahetu na dhanassa hetu, na āyuno vāpi janinda hetu |  
manussayonim abhipatthayāno, tasmā parakkamma tapo karomi ||<sup>80</sup>  
Not for a son, not for riches,<sup>81</sup> nor for long life, O king,, but because  
I am striving for rebirth as a human, do I assiduously practise  
asceticism.

<sup>77</sup> Alsdorf 1968b, p. 478 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 364). See also Alsdorf 1971, p. 52 (*Kl. Sch.*, p. 409).

<sup>78</sup> Gāthā 40: *addhā ha ve sevitabbā sapaññā, bahussutā ye bahuṭhānacintino | narīyo ca [˘ – ˘] disvāna tavañ ca nāga, kāhāmi puññāni anappakāni ||*; 40c: SB L 1550 *nāriyo*. EC *tavañ ca*, S<sup>p</sup> B<sup>p</sup> *tavañ ca*, B<sup>a</sup> S<sup>a</sup> *tvañ ca* (on *tavam/t(u)vam* cf. Trenckner 1879, p. 76 (= 1908, p. 129) and Bollée 1970, p. 93); 40d: E *puññāni* (typographical error). “Certainly the wise are to be honoured, the learned who have wide-ranging knowledge. As I have seen you and the[se] women, o nāga, I will perform many meritorious [deeds].” (On *ha ve* cf. Caillat 1980, p. 56, n. 64; on *pāda b*, cf. Ja III 346,20\* *bahūni thānāni vicintayitvā*). — g. 41 *addhā ha ve sevitabbā sapaññā, bahussutā ye bahuṭhānacintino | narīyo ca [˘ – ˘] disvāna mamañ ca rāja, karohi puññāni anappakāni ||* “As you have seen me and the[se] women, o king, perform many meritorious [deeds].” (41c: SB L 1550 *nāriyo*; 41d: E *punnāni* (typographical error)).

<sup>79</sup> Pādas ab correspond to Ja IV 453,15\*, 16\*, V 176,19\*, 20\*, 26\*, 27\* (Saṅkhapāla Ja). To pādās cd cf. Ja III 306,15\*, 16\*, 24\*, 25\*; V 176,21\*, 22\*, 28\*, 29\*. Cf. also Ja IV 281,19\*–20\* (*suvassa sutvāna subhāsītāni, kāhāmi puññāni anappakāni*).

<sup>80</sup> 36b: S<sup>p</sup> B<sup>d</sup> L 1471 *cāpi* (see below, “Remarks on the text of the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka”, g. 40b).

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Ja V 460,23\*, 24\* (*na dhanassa kārañā, na puttadārassa*).

XXIII–37 tvam̄ lohitakkho vihatantarāmso, alam̄kato kappitakesamassu |  
surosito lohitacandanena, gandhabbarājā va disā pabhāsasi ||<sup>82</sup>

With red eyes, broad back,<sup>83</sup> adorned, trimmed hair and beard, you  
brighten all directions like a Gandhabba king, well rubbed with red  
sandalwood.

XXIV–38 deviddhipatto si mahānubhāvo, sabbehi kāmehi samaṅgibhūto |  
pucchāmi tam̄ nāgarāje tam-attham, seyyo ito kena manussaloko ||<sup>84</sup>

Divine miraculous powers you have attained [already]. You are  
powerful. All you have wished for has been given to you. So I ask  
you, O king of the nāgas, the following: ‘How is the world of men  
better than this [your world]?’

XXV–39 janinda nāññatra manussalokā, suddhī ca sañvijjati samyamo ca |  
ahañ ca laddhāna manussayonim, kāhāmi jātimaraṇassa antam̄ ||<sup>85</sup>

Nowhere, O king, but in the human world is there purity and self-  
discipline. And on attaining rebirth as a human, I shall prepare for an  
end to birth and death.

Amongst the last three gāthās of the Campeyya Jātaka, only g. 42  
causes critical difficulties in the text, but in my opinion they are insur-  
mountable ones. Even the oriental editions offer no variant readings

<sup>82</sup> 37d: E CSB L 1471 *disā pabhāsasi*, jagatī pāda (/ – ˘ – ˘ x). Or to form a  
triṣṭubh pāda should we read m.c. *disā \*pabhāsi* (/ – ˘ – x) (Ch. W.)? Cf. B<sup>p</sup>  
and B<sup>d</sup>, which do in fact have *pabhāsi* at the parallel place in the Saṅkhapāla  
Jātaka, g. 41d (see below, “Remarks on the text of the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka”,  
g. 41d).

<sup>83</sup> Following Alsdorf’s translation (see CPD s.v. *antaramsa-*) of g. 14 of the  
Bhūridatta Jātaka (Alsdorf 1977, p. 47 (= *Kl. Sch.*, p. 807)). According to  
PED (s.v. *antaramsa-*), “with broad breast”.

<sup>84</sup> For pāda b cf. Mvu II 187,22\* (*divyehi kāmehi samāṅgibhūtah*)

<sup>85</sup> 39a: L 1471 *nāññattha*; 39b: S<sup>a</sup> L 1471 *suddhi vā*, C<sup>p</sup> *suddhī ca*, C<sup>a</sup> *suddhī ca*, S<sup>p</sup> B *suddhī va* ... *vā*. Cf. Saṅkhapāla Ja g. 43b: C *suddhi vā* ... *saññamo vā* (C<sup>a</sup> cty: *samyamo*), SB L 1550 *suddhī va* (S<sup>a</sup> *vā*) ... *samyamo vā* (exactly  
as the cty in S<sup>a</sup> and B<sup>d</sup>), and Mvu II 188,2\* (ms B) *sañvidyate* (/ti) <sup>†</sup>*sod[h]i* *va*  
*samyamo vā* (cf. Smith 1953, p. 124). For a comparison of the content, see Ja  
III 47,14\*–15\*: *so hi nūna ito gantvā yonim laddhāna mānusim | vadaññu*  
*sīlasampanno kāhāmi kusalam bahum*.

which are (metrically) correct.<sup>86</sup> Pāda c exhibits a false cadence (*sovaññagharāni* – – | √ √ – –). Moreover, *kāraya* (L 1550 *kāreyya*, – √ × or – – ×), taken by SC (L) into pāda c, gives the verse 14 syllables. Furthermore, *rūpiyassa*, now moved into first place, would have to be read as three syllables \**rūpyassa* (third syllable short). The construction in all cases remains obscure. Who is the subject of *haritvā* ... *kāraya/kāreyya* and *karontu/karotu*? The only solution I can offer is Fausbøll's suggested emendation, g. 42cd: *ito haritvā suvaññam gharāni, rūpyassa cā* (sic) *pākāram karontu*. The translation must necessarily remain uncertain.

XXVI-42 idāñ ca me jātarūpam pahūtam, rāśī suvaññassa ca tālamattā |  
ito haritvā sovaññagharāni, [kāraya] rūpiyassa ca pākāram karontu ||

Here, this is my plentiful [unworked] gold and here a pile of [worked] gold, as high as a palm tree. [This] you may (?) take with you from here and ... build [yourself] golden houses and a wall of silver.

XXXVII-43 \*muttāna ca vāhasahassāni pañca, veñur'yanissānam ito haritvā |  
antepure bhūmiyam santharantu, nikkaddamā hohiti nīrajā ca ||<sup>87</sup>

<sup>86</sup>SC = E; 42a: L 1550 *imañ*; 42c: L 1550 *haretvā*, B *haritvāna suvañña*° (thus also the cty); 42cd: SC take *kāraya* to pāda c, L 1550 *kāreyya* (taken into pāda c) ... *karotu*, B *karassu rūpiyapākaram karontu*. For the correspondence of (ECS<sup>a</sup>) *kāraya* and (B) *karassu* see von Hinüber 2001, § 415, and Oberlies 2001, p. 199.

<sup>87</sup>43a: E B *muttā ca*, CS C<sup>ks</sup> (Fausbøll) L 1550 *muttānañ ca* (*muttāna* – – √, gen. pl. in -āna); 43b: E CB S<sup>p</sup> *veñuriyamissāni*, S<sup>a</sup> °*missānam*, L 1550 *vedurimissāni ito haretvā*; 43d: SB L 1550 *hehiti* (cf. Smith 1952, p. 179 and von Hinüber 2001, § 471). The frequently used Prakrit genitive plural in -āna is variously attested in Pāli too (see Oberlies 2001, p. 147). Cf. Mvu II 187,11\*-14\* (with emendations in pādas b (already in Charpentier 1909, p. 43) and according to Jones 1952, p. 180, notes 1f): *muktāna te vāhaśatāni pañca, vaiñuryamiśrāna \*dadāmi rājñe | antaḥpure bhūmi +samāstarāhi, niśkardamā +bheṣyati \*nīrajā \*ca ||* Senart 1890: pāda b: *dadāsi*; pāda c: *samāstarā hi* (BHS *saṃastarā*, cf. *saṃ-ā-str* Mbh, Rāmāyaṇa, Jātakamālā (pw); -āhi, instr. pl., Edgerton 1953a, § 9.102; or read \**saṃastarehi* (instr. pl. of *saṃastara*-?) ; pāda d: *niśkardamā tviśimati nīrarāja*.

Five thousand coaches of pearls mixed with beryl you are to take from here and spread them on the floor of your palace [so that] it becomes free of dirt and dust.

Silver, gold, pearls, and jewels count as the special property of snakes (cf. Ja II 296,12\*-14\*: *rajatam jātarūpāñ ca muttā veñuriyā bahū | te ca tena asantutthā bhiyyo-bhiyyo akhāñisum || te tatthāsīviso ghorotejasī tejasā hani |*).<sup>88</sup>

XXVIII-44 etādisam āvasa rājaseṭṭha, vimānasetṭham bahu sobhamānam |  
bārāṇasim nagaram iddhaphītam, rajañ ca kārehi anomapañña ||<sup>89</sup>

O best of kings, live in such a magnificent palace, which shines brightly, [and also] in the flourishing city of Vārāṇasī. Reign [there], you who are so full of wisdom.

If this reconstruction of the “original” Campeyya Jātaka is correct, then it follows that the Campeyya Jātaka of the Mahāvastu must be directly based on the Pāli version. Various Jātakas found in the Jātaka as well as in the Mahāvastu should be studied with regard to their relationship to each other in order to lend support to the conclusion reached here.<sup>90</sup>

Thomas Oberlies  
Göttingen

<sup>88</sup>On snakes and jewels see Gaeffke 1954.

<sup>89</sup>44c: SB *iddham phītam*.

<sup>90</sup>Different versions of the Campeyya Jātaka in Buddhist literature are analysed by Hahn 1995.

## APPENDIX

## Remarks on the text of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka (Fausbøll V 161–77)

4a: BCS *vanijja*, B<sup>d</sup> L 1550 *vānijjam* and commentaries (*vanijjan ti*). *vānijja(m)* scans - - (i.e. it ends with a short nasal vowel).

4b: Hypermetric triṣṭubh (B B<sup>d</sup> *bhojanaputte*). Should we not read *pathē* \**ddasāsim* (third syllable short) instead of *pathē addasāsim*, which is correct in the cadence of 39a? (O.v.H., Ch.W.)

7a: BCS L 1550 *sakam niketam* (˘ / - - -); cf. g. 47c, Ja III 349,22\* and Ja IV 341,24\*.

7c: Read with BC S<sup>a</sup> L 1550 *māmsāni* ( - - ˘).

7d: Probably \**kho* is to be read instead of (ES) *vo* (Ch.W.) or eastern (BC) *ve* = Skt *vai* (cf. Lüders 1954, § 23) (O.v.H.).

10a: Read (with S) *tada'ssu* (B *tadā'ssu*, C *tadassu*). Cf. however, CPD s.v. <sup>5</sup>*assu*. On the particle (*a*)*ssu* cf. Kern 1909, p. 236, n. 2; Norman 1980, p. 165; Sakamoto-Goto 1989, pp. 96ff.; and Oberlies 2001, p. 53, n. 3.

10b: For the translation see Hinüber 1985, p. 61.

11c: Read (with S<sup>P</sup>) *tada 'ss' aham* (B *tadā 'ss' aham*, C *tadassaham*, S *tada 'ss'āham*). Thus also 27b (cf. Alsdorf 1971, p. 52 = *Kl. Sch.*, p. 409). Cf., however, CPD s.v. <sup>5</sup>*assu*.

12c: Jagatī pāda (cadence: - - - - (cf. Smith 1949, p. 1154)).

13a: *agamāsi* is to be read ≈ - ˘, otherwise syllable three long (O.v.H.).

13c: BC *samotatam jambuhi vetasāhi*, L 1550 *saṁthitam jambuhi vedisāhi*, S *saṁonatam* (S<sup>a</sup> *saṁmonatam*) *jambuhi vedisāhi*.

14d: *hadayaṅgamam* (thus all mss) is to be read ≈ - - - (O.v.H.). Otherwise, all readings *hadayaṅgama-* are to be read as four syllables (cf. Ja IV 345,5\* and 470,16\*/20\*). On the grounds of the ten-syllable śloka pāda (*sic*) *hadayaṅgam hadayanissitam* (Ja IV 345,5\*, 420,1\*), one might suspect that perhaps an old *hadāṅgama-* (cf. Skt *hrdga[ma]-*) had been overlaid during the course of transmission (cf. \**hadanissita*, Ja III 215,3\*, 390,24\*, for the transmitted *hadayanissita*-).

15a: BCS L 1550 *pitā alāra* ( - - - ) (Fausbøll conjectures *c' alāra* (cf. 37a and 50c)).

15d: C<sup>a</sup> S<sup>a</sup> *ālāra* (*sic*) *passa me nivesanam*, B C<sup>P</sup> S<sup>P</sup> = E.

17a: Against all mss with CPD (s.v. *anāvakūlā*). Note that “*u* and *ū* and *i* and *ī* can hardly be distinguished in the mss” (O.v.H.).

18c: All mss = E.. Hypermetric (Ch.W.). Read *rajataggalam* \**sonṇamayam* [/\**sovaṇṇam*] *ulāram*? Ja VI 203,8\* (*yūpam subham* *sonṇamayam* *ulāram*) indicates the former.

19: All mss = E (19c: L 1550 *paripurī*, BCS *paripūrā*; 19d : B<sup>P</sup> C S<sup>a</sup> *sovaṇṇa*°). What do the feminine adjectives refer to? (Fausbøll wishes to correct all to -*am*).

20: All mss = E (B *āruhya*). The *verbum finitum* is missing, unless the absolute functions as such.

20d: Read *yath' assa bharīyā mahesī ahosi* with anapæstic scansion of *mahesī* (see Oberlies 2001, p. 15); cf. 23d and 26a (Ch.W.).

21b: Read *velurīyamayam* (Ch.W.).

22a: All mss = E. Read *tato mam urago* (˘ - ˘ [˘ ˘ -]).

22b: L 1550 *nisīdapayī*.

22c: Read (with B C<sup>P</sup> S) *atra bhavam* (cf. CPD s.v. <sup>1</sup>*atra*).

23a: L 1550 *aññatarā ca*.

23d: Read (with BCS B<sup>d</sup> L 1550) *bharīyā va* (Dutoit V 173, n. 1, already declared himself in favour of this reading (Ch.W.)).

24b: Read with BCS L 1550 *sovaṇṇamayāya pātiyā*; (*jagatī pāda* : cadence - - - -). Cf. Ja IV 18,14\*: *paggayha sovaṇṇamayāya pātiyā*.

24c: Jagatī pāda (cadence: - - - -).

24d: *upanāmayī* is to be read ≈ - - - (O.v.H.). (BCS = E) *bhatta* scans - ˘ (i.e. it ends with a short nasal vowel).

25a: *turiyehi* is to be read ≈ - ˘ (O.v.H.).

25c: Read (with BCS<sup>P</sup> ( and L 1550 ?)) *nipatī mahantam* ( - - - ).

26a: *bhariyā* scans ≈ - (O.v.H.).

26b: BCS<sup>P</sup> L 1550 *attamajjhā* (cf. CPD s.v. *atthamajjhā-* and Lüders 1941, p. 142, who draws attention to *aṭṭhakathāyam pana sumajjhā ti pātho* in the commentary).

26c: Read with B<sup>S</sup> L 1550 *kāmakārā* (add the entry *kāmakāra-* “fulfilling the desires” in CPD; Cone includes it, but with the wrong reading *kāmakāro* of C = E).

27b: *uttarī* (so Alsdorf 1971, p. 52 = *Kl. Sch.*, p. 409) seems unnecessary (Ch.W.)).

28a: Read (with BC) *adhicca-laddham* (see also CPD s.v.). Item 29a.

28b: All mss = E. Fausbøll proposes reading \**ādu*.

28c: BCS B<sup>d</sup> L 1550 have *nāgarāje tam attham* which Alsdorf (1977, p. 39, n. 54 = *Kl. Sch.*, p. 799, n. 54) interprets as *nāgarāj'* *etam attham*. But *nāga-*

*rāje* may well be a vocative ending in *-e* (cf. Caillat 1970, pp. 18–19, and Oberlies 2001, p. 170).

29a: Hypermetric triṣṭubh pāda (and also 29b). L 1550 omits the second *na*.

30a: *brahmacariyam* scans – – – (= *brahmacariyam*). Item 33a.

30c: Cf. 28c.

31a: Jagatī pāda ([*Maga*] *dhānam issaro* (– – – –)).

Between gāthās 32 and 33 in BCS<sup>P</sup> (not in S<sup>a</sup>) and B<sup>ds</sup> there is an additional verse ≠ Vidhurapāṇḍita Jātaka 252 = 276, where 251cd = (Saṅkhapāla Jātaka) 32cd, 253ab = 33ab, 254a = 33c; cf. Alsdorf 1971, pp. 49f., 52f. (= *Kl. Sch.*, pp. 406f., 409f.):

*mālāñ ca gandhañ ca vilepanañ ca | padīpiyam yānam upassayañ ca | acchādanam sayanam ath' annapāñam | sakkacca dānāni adamha tattha ||*  
B<sup>d</sup>, B<sup>s</sup> *pacipayam annapāñam, adamma*; B<sup>P</sup> *acchādanam seyyam ath' annapāñam, sakkacca dānāni adamma tattha*; C<sup>P</sup> *annapāñam* (pāda c is hypermetric; read *seyyam ath'* with B<sup>P</sup>?).

34c: *appānubhāvā* (thus all mss) “on the basis of” (CPD s.v. differs).

35a: All mss *anvagatam* (item 36a), a transformation of an old aorist form *anugāñ* (< *annaga[m]* < Skt *anvagāt*) into a verbal adjective (other explanation in CPD s.v. *anvagata-*: “*anugata* influenced by aor. *anvagāt*”, referring to *udapatto* (on the latter cf. Hinüber 1974, pp. 69f.)).

35b: BC *nānvagāñ*, SP *nānvagatam*, S<sup>a</sup> *anvagatam* (*na* is omitted), L 1550 *anugatam* (*na* is omitted here, too). CPD (s.v. *anu-gacchatī*) proposes reading \**anvagā*.

37a: BCS L 1550 *pañcadasiñ*.

39c: *siriyā ca* scans ≈ – –.

40b: L 1550 *vāpi*.

40d: *tapo* (typographical error in E) (cf. Alsdorf 1977, p. 29, n. 20 = *Kl. Sch.*, p. 789, n. 20).

41d: Jagatī pāda (*disā pabhāsasi* – – – –). Or is *pabhāsi* to be read with B<sup>P</sup> v.l. and B<sup>d</sup>? (Ch.W.). Cf. also Fausbøll’s C<sup>s</sup>, which has *pabhassi*, and see n. 82 above.

42c: Cf. 28c.

43b: B SP L 1550 *suddhī vā ... samyamo vā*, S<sup>a</sup> *suddhi va ... samyamo vā*, C *suddhi vā ... saññamo vā* (cf. Campeyya Jātaka 39a *suddhī ca ... samyamo ca* (vv.ll. *vā ... vā*); see n. 85 above).

43d: BC SP L 1550 *jātimarañassa*, S<sup>a</sup> *jātimarañassa* (cf. Campeyya Jātaka 39d).

44a: Jagatī pāda (– – – –).

45b: CPD (s.v. *upaññahati*) conjectured \**upatiññhare*.

45c: CS L 1550 *kaccin nu te nābhisaññittha koci* (S<sup>a</sup> *kacci*), B *kaccin nu tam nābhisaññittha*. E ex. conj. *nābhisaññittha* (see CPD s.v. *abhisam̄sati*).

46b: Unmetrical *paññivihito* should probably be emended (Ch.W.).

47b: With BCS<sup>P</sup> L 1550 *dhanāharo* (– – –); cf. Vidhurapāṇḍita Jātaka g. 39 *manīm ... dhanāharām* (cf. Alsdorf 1971, p. 35 = *Kl. Sch.*, p. 392).

47d: BCS *ossajassu* (B<sup>P</sup> *osajassu*); cf. CPD s.v. *ussaj(j)ati*.

49a: Jagatī pāda (– – – –). B *dumapphalanīva*. Gāthās 48ab and 49 are also found at M II 74.7–12 (all mss *dumapphalanīva*) and Th 787cd and 788 (all mss *dumapphalanīva* (cf. also Norman 1969, p. 238, ad loc.)), pādas 49ab are also found at Ja IV 49.5.12\* (where all mss also have *dumapphalanīva*).

49b: *daharā* is to be read ≈ – – (O.v.H.).

50c: S *tuvañ ca* (ECB *tavañ ca*); cf. n. 78.

#### FAUSBØLL'S TEXT OF THE SAṄKHAPĀLA JĀTAKA

4a *vanijja* // 4b *pathe addasāsim hi milācaputte* // 7a *sakam niketanam* // 7c *māmsam bhokkhāma pamodamānā* // 7d *mayañ hi vo sattavo pannagānam* // 10a *tad assu* // 10b *yam natthuto paññimokkh' assa pāse* // 11c *tad ass' aham* // 12c *dukkho hi luddehi punā samāgamo* // 13a *agamāsi so rahadām vippasannam* // 13c *samotatañ jambuhi vetasāhi* // 14d *hadayañgamam* // 15a *tvam me si mātā ca pitā ca alāra* // 15ef *pahūtabhakkhañ bahu-annapāñam | masakkasāram viya vāsavassa* // 17a *anāvakulā* // 18c *rajataggañam sovaññamayam ulāram* // 19 *mañimayā sovaññamayā ulārā | anekacittā satatañ sunimittā | paripūra kaññāhi alamkatāhi | suvaññakāyūradharāhi rāja* // 20 *so saṅkhapālo taramānarūpo | pāsādam āruhya anomavañño | sahassathambham atulānubhāvam | yath' assa bhariyā mahesī ahosi* // 21b *veñuriyamayam* // 22a–c *tato mam urago hatthe gahetvā | niśidayī pamukhañ āsanasmīm | idam āsanam atrabhavañ niśidatu* // 23a *aññā ca nārī taramānarūpā* // 23d *bhariyā ca bhattū patino piyassa* // 24b–d *paggayha sovaññamayā pātiyā | anekasūpam vividham viyañjanam | upanāmayī bhatta manuññarūpam* // 25a *turiyehi* // 25c *tatuttarīm mam nipati mahantañ* // 26a–c *bhariyā mam' etā tisatā alāra | sabb' atthamajjhā padumuttarābhā | alāra etā su te kāmakāro* // 27b *tadass' aham uttarīm paccabhbāsim* // 28a *adhicca laddham* // 28b *sayañkatañ udāhu devehi dinnam* // 28c *nāgarāja tam attham* //

29ab nādhicca laddham na pariñāmajam me | na sayamkataṁ na pi devehi  
 dinnam // 30a brahmacariyam // 30c, 42c nāgarāje tam attham // 31a rājā ahosīm  
 magadhānam issaro // 33–34 tam me vatam tam pana brahmacariyam | tassa  
 suciññassa ayam vipāko | ten’ eva me laddham idam vimānam | pahūta-  
 bhakkham bahu-annapānam || naccehi gītehi upetarūpam | ciraññitikam na ca  
 sassat’ āyam | appānubhāvā tam mahānubhāvam | tejassinaṁ hanti atejavanto |  
 kim eva dāthāvudha kiṁ paṭicca | hatthattham āgañchi vanibbakānam // 35ab  
 bhayan nu te anvagatam mahantam | tejo nu te nānvagam dantamūlam // 36a na  
 me bhayaṁ anvagatam mahantam // 37a pannarasiñ c’ alāra // 40b na āyuno  
 cāpi alāra hetu // 41d gandhabbarājā va disā pabhāsasi // 43b suddhī  
 ca sañvijjati saññamo vā // 43d kāhāmi jātīmarañassa antam // 44a  
 sañvaccharo me vusito tav’ antike // 45b niccānusītthā upatiññhate tam // 45c  
 kaccin nu te nābhisamśittha koci // 46b putto piyo paññivihito va seyyo // 47b  
 dhanāhāro mañiratanam ulāram // 47d laddhā dhanam tam mañim ussajassu //  
 49a dhumapphalān’ eva patanti mānavā // 49b daharā ca vuddhā ca sarīrabhedā  
 // 50c nāgañ ca sutvāna tavañ c’ alāra //

## ABBREVIATIONS

Editions and manuscripts:

B <sup>P</sup>	Burmese ed. of the Pāli, <i>Chatthasaṅgītipiṭakam</i> (1960)
B <sup>S</sup>	Burmese ed. of the Atthavaññanā, <i>Chatthasaṅgītipiṭakam</i> (1960)
B	= B <sup>P</sup> + B <sup>S</sup>
B <sup>d</sup> , B <sup>s</sup>	Burmese mss in Fausbøll ed.
C <sup>P</sup>	Sinhalese ed. of the Pāli, Simon Hewavitarne Bequest (1937)
C <sup>a</sup>	Sinhalese ed. of the Atthavaññanā, Simon Hewavitarne Bequest (1955)
C	= C <sup>P</sup> + C <sup>a</sup>
E	European edition (Fausbøll)
Fausbøll	= E
L 1471	a manuscript of the Campeyya Jātaka written in Northern Thai from Vat Lai Hin, Amphoe Ko Kha near Lampang, written in the year c.s. 833 = A.D. 1471
L 1550	a manuscript of the Sañkhapāla Jātaka written in Northern Thai from Vat Srī Ur Meiñ in Dā Soy (Thā Soi), now in the Vat Lai Hin, written in c.s. 912 = A.D. 1550, in the year of the dog ( <i>pī kad ses</i> ). <sup>91</sup>
S <sup>P</sup>	Siamese ed. of the Pāli, <i>Syāmarāñhassa Tepiṭakam</i> (1926)
S <sup>a</sup>	Siamese ed. of the Atthavaññanā, <i>Syāmarāñhassa Tepiṭakam</i> (1927)
S	S <sup>P</sup> + S <sup>a</sup>
Vv	Vimānavatthu, PTS ed.

Other abbreviations:

Ch.W.	suggestions by Prof. Dr Chlodwig H. Werba
Cone	Margaret Cone, <i>A Dictionary of Pāli</i> , Part 1.
CPD	<i>A Critical Pāli Dictionary</i>
cty	commentary
g(g).	gāthā(s)
jag.	jagatī
Kl. Sch.	<i>Kleine Schriften</i> , J.v. Glaserapp-stiftung
O.v.H.	suggestions by Prof. Dr. Oskar von Hinüber
PED	<i>The Pali Text Society’s Pali–English Dictionary</i>
tr.	triśubh

<sup>91</sup>I am grateful to Prof. von Hinüber for this reference (see also Hinüber 1988, p. 14 with n. 48 (on the allocation of sigla)).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alsdorf, L. 1957a. "The Story of Citta and Sambhūta", *Felicitation Volume Presented to Prof. S.K. Belvalkar*. Benares, pp. 202–208. (*Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 186–92.)

—. 1957b. "Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-Jātaka", *WZKS* 1, pp. 1–70. (*Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 270–339.)

—. 1968a. "Die Āryā-Strophen des Pali-Kanons", *AWLM*, no. 4 (1967) (Wiesbaden, 1968).

—. 1968b. "Das Sivijātaka (499) : Ein Beitrag zu seiner Textgeschichte", *Pratidānam* (Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F.B.J. Kuiper). The Hague, pp. 478–83. (*Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 364–69.)

—. 1971. "Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura", *WZKS* 15, pp. 23–56. (*Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 380–413.)

—. 1977. "Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka: Ein anti-brahmanischer Nāga-Roman". *WZKS* 21, pp. 25–55. (*Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart, 1998, pp. 785–815.)

Bollée, W.B. 1970. *Kuṇālajātaka : Being an Edition and Translation*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. XXVI. London.

Caillat, C. 1970. *Pour une nouvelle grammaire du Pāli*. Istituto di Indologia della Università di Torino, Conferenze IV. Torino.

—. 1980. "La langue primitive du bouddhisme", in H. Bechert, ed., *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*, pp. 43–60. Göttingen.

Charpentier, J. 1909. "Textstudien zum Mahāvastu", *Le Monde Oriental* 3, pp. 34–69.

Cone, M., and R.F. Gombrich. 1977. *The Perfect Generosity of Prince Vessantara : A Buddhist Epic*. Oxford.

Dutoit, J. 1913. *Jātakam, das Buch der Erzählungen aus früheren Existzenzen Buddhas*. Vol. V. Lepizig.

Edgerton, F. [1953]. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, Vol. II, *Dictionary*. New Haven, 1953 (reprint: Delhi, 1977).

—. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, Vol. I, *Grammar*. New Haven, 1953. (reprint: Delhi, 1977).

Gaeffke, P. 1954. "The Snake-Jewel in Ancient Indian Literature". *IL* 14, pp. 581–94.

Geiger, W. [1916]. *Pali Literatur und Sprache*. Strassburg, 1916.

Grünwedel, A. 1897. *Buddhistische Studien*. Berlin (Veröffentlichungen aus dem Königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde, V. Band).

Hahn, M. 1995. "Der duldsame Nāgakönig: Gopadattas Nāgajātaka", *BIS* 8, pp. 87–135.

Hinüber, O. von. 1974. "Reste des reduplizierten Aorists im Pali", *MSS* 32, pp. 64–72.

—. 1983. "Rez. : Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung", H. Bechert, ed. (Göttingen 1980), *IF* 88, pp. 307–12.

—. 1985. "Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien", *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur*, H. Bechert, ed. Göttingen, pp. 57–75.

—. 1988. "Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung", *AWLM* no. 8 (Wiesbaden).

—. 2001. "Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick", *SbÖAW* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20).

Jones, J.J., tr. 1952. *The Mahāvastu*, Vol. II. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. XVIII. London.

Kern, H. 1891. *The Jātaka-Mālā or Bodhisattvāvadāna-Mālā by Ārya-īura*. HOS I. London.

—. 1909. "Das Verbum āyūhati im Pāli", *IF* 25, pp. 234–38.

Leslie, J. 1998. "A Bird Bereaved: The Identity and Significance of Vālmīki's *krauñca*", *JIP* 26, pp. 455–87.

Leumann, E., and S. Watanabe. 1970. "Mahāvastu II, pp. 83–121, translated by Ernst Leumann and Shoko Watanabe". *Acta Indologica* I, pp. 65–108.

Lüders, H. 1897. "Die Sage von Rṣyaśrīnga", *Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, pp. 87–135. (*Philologica Indica*, pp. 1–42).

—. 1921. *Buddhistische Märchen*. Jena.

—. 1941. *Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur*. AKM XXVI,3 (reprint: Nendeln, 1966).

—. 1954. *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*. Berlin. (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1952, no. 10.)

Malalasekera, G.P. 1937. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. PTS.

Mehendale, M.A.. 1970. "On the Name and Gāthā 12 of the Takkāriyajātaka" in *Seminar on Prakrit Studies* (June 23–27, 1969), Poona, pp. 125–130.

Norman, K.R. 1969. *The Elders' Verses*, Vol. I.

—. 1980. "Notes on the Vessantarajātaka" in *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus* (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf), K. Bruhn and A. Wezler, eds., Wiesbaden, pp. 163–74.

Oberlies, Th. 2001. *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka*. Berlin.

Oldenberg, H. 1918. "Jātakastudien", *Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, pp. 429–68 (*Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1967, pp. 1069–108).

Pischel, Richard. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg.

Regamey, C. 1954. "Randbemerkungen zur Sprache und Textüberlieferung des Kāraṇḍavyūha", *Asiatica* (Festschrift Fr. Weller), Leipzig, pp. 514–27.

Sakamoto-Goto, J. 1984. "Das Udayajātaka", *WZKS* 28, pp. 45–66.

—. 1989. "Drś et paś en Pāli", *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, C. Caillat, ed. Paris, pp. 393–411.

Senart, E. [1890]. *Le Mahāvastu*, Vol. II. Paris (reprint: Tokyo, 1977).

Smith, H. 1949. *Saddanīti*, Vol. IV, Tables, Part 1, E. Conspectus terminorum (metricorum). Lund, pp. 1105–72.

—. 1950. *Les deux prosodies du vers bouddhique*. Lund (K. Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse, 1949–1950, I).

—. 1952. "Le Futur moyen indien et ses rythmes", *JA* 240, pp. 169–83.

—. 1953. "En marge du vocabulaire sanskrit des bouddhistes, I", *OS* 2, pp. 119–28.

Speyer, J.S., trans. 1895. *The Jātakamālā: Garland of Birth Stories of Āryaśūra*. London (reprint: Delhi, 1971).

Trenckner, V. 1879. *Pali Miscellany*. London (= *JPTS* 1908, pp. 102–51).

Vogel, J.P. 1926. *Indian Serpent-Lore*. London (reprint: Benares, 1972).

Wackernagel, J. 1937. "Altindische und mittelindische Miszellen", *BSOS* 8 (1935–1937, Festschrift Sir George Grierson), pp. 823–34 (*Kleine Schriften*, Göttingen, 1929, pp. 405–16).

## The Colophons of Burmese Manuscripts

1. Looking through editions of the texts of Buddhist scriptures in Pāli and through catalogues of manuscripts from Theravāda Buddhist countries, it appears that, as a rule, the final remarks in Burmese manuscripts are not mentioned. They are not found in descriptions of manuscripts given in editions of the texts or included in the entries for a codex in catalogues of manuscripts. This can be ascribed both to the editors' and revisers' insufficient knowledge of the Burmese language and to their reluctance to invest too much time and effort in the elucidation of passages forming no part of the text at the end of manuscripts along with final remarks which can be understood as colophons in the stricter sense. Usually, there is merely a note of the formal data, and the title and date of completion of writing.

The three volumes of the catalogue *Burmese Manuscripts*<sup>1</sup> contain detailed descriptions of manuscripts in German libraries. Thanks to the ruling that the beginning and end of manuscripts are to be reproduced in

---

First published in German in *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Zweite Folge, Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, eds. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 8. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), pp. 35–39. Translated by Marianne Rankin.

<sup>1</sup>*Burmese Manuscripts (Bur. MSS)*, Part I, compiled by Heinz Bechert, Daw Tin Tin Myint, Daw Khin Khin Su (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979); Part II, Catalogue numbers 156–431, compiled by Heinz Braun, Daw Tin Tin Myint, with an introduction by Heinz Bechert (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1985); Part III, Catalogue numbers 432–735, Heinz Braun, compiler, assisted by Anne Peters; Heinz Bechert, ed. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996). This essay is based entirely on the material in these volumes of this catalogue of manuscripts. The reader is therefore requested to consult the introduction to Part I for further information. As regards the abbreviations used here, see the List of Abbreviations in Part 3. [Since this article appeared, Part IV, Catalogue numbers 736–900, has been published: Anne Peters, compiler; Heinz Bechert, ed. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2000).]